REMARKS

Claims 1-59 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 10-14, 16, 17, 32-37, and 56-59 are rejected. Claims 3-9 and 15 are objected to. Claims 18-31 and 38-55 are allowed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 32-37 and 56-59 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Further, claims 1, 2, 10-14, 16, 17, 32-34, 36, 37, 56, 57, and 59 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,272,625) in view of Delestienne et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,162).

The Examiner further objected to claim 56 due to an informality and to claims 3-9, 15, 35 and 58 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The rejections from the Office Action of August 18, 2005 are discussed below in connection with the various claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

I. OBJECTION AND REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 56 was objected to due to an informality and claims 32-37 and 56-59 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With this response, claims 32-37 and 56-59 have been amended for clarity and not for reasons relating to patentability.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Independent Claims 1, 32, and 56

Independent claims 1, 32, and 56 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishihara et al. in view of Delestienne et al. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nishihara et al. nor Delestienne et al., alone or in combination, disclose all of the clements of the Applicants' claims.

Nishihara et al. relates to "a medical image data managing system [in which] a directory managing unit is employed so as to manage directory data on overall medical image data. The medical image data managing system comprises: a plurality of modality units for producing

medical image data in accordance with sorts of the modality unit a plurality of database units for storing at least the medical image data produced from the modality units: workstation units for issuing a demand to fetch desirable medical image data from the database units and for displaying the fetched medical image data; and, a directory managing unit for storing directory information about to which database units the desirable medical image data has been stored and for outputting the directory information upon receipt of the demand issued from the workstation means." See Nishibara et al., Abstract.

Delestienne et al. relates to "[a] field service unit ... for providing interactive field service of medical diagnostic systems. The field service unit includes a service platform installed on a portable system, such as a portable computer. The field service unit is adapted to formulate service requests, transmit and receive service data, and render field service to a variety of medical diagnostic system modalities. The field service unit includes communications modules for linking the field service unit to a remote service facility and to subscribing medical diagnostic systems. Service requests may originate in the field service unit, or in the remote service facility, or in the medical diagnostic system, with the field service unit being informed of the state of service requests via a network link." See Delestienne et al., Abstract.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Nishihara et al. nor Delestienne et al. disclose: "receiving a sequence of inputs, said sequence of inputs operative to manipulate said displayed image data from said second arrangement to a third arrangement, without substantially altering said first arrangement; and recording said sequence of inputs, said recorded sequence of inputs being capable of being automatically applied to said displayed image data having said second arrangement to realize said third arrangement without substantially altering said first arrangement" as claimed in claim 1; "allowing a user to manipulate at least one of said image data on said first display parameters to define a viewing configuration of a portion of said image data on said first display without substantially altering said image data, without substantially altering said image data, whereby said stored user defined viewing configuration is capable of being retrieved to recreate said user defined viewing configuration of said image data" as claimed in claim 32; or "means for allowing a user to manipulate at least one of said first plurality of display parameters to define a viewing configuration of a portion of said image data on said first display without substantially altering said image data; and means for storing said user defined viewing

configuration independent of said image data, without substantially altering said image data, whereby said stored user defined viewing configuration is capable of being retrieved to recreate said user defined viewing configuration of said portion of said image data" as claimed in claim 56.

Nishihara et al. merely discloses a system for storing medical image data but fails to disclose how users may access and manipulate that image data, or further, how the manipulated images may be stored. Delestienne et al. merely discloses a system for performing field service on imaging systems and for storing data related thereto. Delestienne et al., however, does not disclose the storing or manipulation of image data by users of the imaging system.

The Examiner refers only to generic figure references of Nishihara et al. and provided no citations to Delestienne et al. Accordingly, the Examiner failed to demonstrate that Nishihara et al. or Delestienne et al. disclosed all of the claimed elements. Should the Examiner maintain their rejection of these claims, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide specific citations to the cited references supporting the Examiner's position for each element of Applicants' claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 32, and 56 are not obvious in view of, Nishihara et al. or Delestienne et al., alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections of these claims.

B. Dependent Claims 2, 10-14, 16, 17, 33, 34, 36, 37, 57, and 59

Dependent claims 2, 10-14, 16, 17, 33, 34, 36, 37, 57, and 59 were also rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishihara et al. in view of Delestienne et al.. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2, 10-14, 16, 17, 33, 34, 36, 37, 57, and 59 should also be allowed for at least the same reasons set out above for the independent base claims. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of these claims.

III. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 18-31 and 38-55.

Claims 3-9, 15, 35, and 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that these claims are allowable, but have chosen not to rewrite them at this time.

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated August 18, 2005 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

PLEASE MAIL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Siemens Corporation Customer No. 28524

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator

170 Wood Avenue South

Iselin, NJ 08830

Respectfully submitted,

Herer Lam, Reg. No. 44,855

Attorney(s) for Applicant(s) Telephone: 650-943-7350

Date: _____/8/05